

JOHN CHIANG Chair

BETTY T. YEE Member

MICHAEL C. GENEST Member

April 2007 Franchise Tax Board Litigation Roster

All currently active cases and those recently closed are listed on the roster. Activity or changes with respect to a case appear in bold-face type. Any new cases will appear in bold-face type.

A list of new cases that have been added to the roster for the month is also provided, as well as a list of cases that have been closed and will be dropped from the next report.

The Franchise Tax Board posts the Litigation Roster on its Internet site. The Litigation Roster can be found at: http://www.ftb.ca.gov/law/litrstr/index.html.

The Litigation Rosters for the last four years may be found on the Internet site.

FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX Closed Cases – April 2007

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court Number</u>

News America Incorporated Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC350576

Sunoco, Incorporated Sacramento Superior Court No. 06AS03797

FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX New Cases – April 2007

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court Number</u>

Abbott Laboratories Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC369808

Bakersfield Mall, LLC San Francisco Superior Court No. CGC07462728

Mercury General Corp. San Francisco Superior Court No. CGC 07462688

FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX MONTHLY REFUND LITIGATION ROSTER

April 2007

ABBOTT LABORATORIES & Affiliates v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC369808

Filed – 04/20/07 <u>FTB's Counsel</u> Brian Wesley

Taxpayer's Counsel

J. Pat Powers

Baker & McKenzie, LLP

Issue: Whether Plaintiffs were entitled to a deduction under section 24402 after the statute was found

to be unconstitutional.

Years: 1999-2000 Amount \$715,735.00

Status: Plaintiffs' Summons and Complaint was filed on April 20, 2007 and served personally on

Franchise Tax Board on April 23, 2007.

BAKERSFIELD MALL, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. No. CGC07462728 Filed – 04/25/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> <u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

Marguerite Stricklin

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the LLC fee imposed on an LLC doing business entirely within California by Rev. Tax. Code §17942 is unconstitutional under the due process, equal protection and commerce clauses of the U.S. Constitution.

2. Whether Rev. Tax. Code §17942 violates Article XIII, section 26 of the California Constitution.

3. Whether Rev. Tax. Code §17942 constitutes an invalid exercise of the states police power and is void.

<u>Years</u>: 2000 through 2004 <u>Amount</u> \$56,537.00

Status: Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint filed on April 25, 2007, and served personally on the

Franchise Tax Board on April 26, 2007.

BLACKIE, GERALD v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC362241 Filed – 11/21/06

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselPaul William RaymondAnthony Sgherzi

Attorney at Law

Issues: 1. Whether Plaintiff was a resident of California for the year 1994.

2. Whether Plaintiff would be subject to any penalties if the tax is sustained.

<u>Year</u>: 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$538,997.00

Status: Initial Status Conference held on March 9, 2007. Trial scheduled for December 3, 2007.

BRAR, Kaldeep S. & Imelda A. & Professional Resource Enterprises, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC365233

Filed - 01/24/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> Robert F Klueger, Esq. FTB's Counsel

Boldra, Klueger & Stein, LLP

Mark P. Richelson

<u>Issue</u>: 1. Whether FTB properly determined the Los Angeles Revitalization Zone credit carryovers to which

Plaintiffs were entitled.

Year: 1999 Amount \$335,885.53

Status: Defendant's Demurrer filed on March 18, 2007. Hearing on Demurrer to be held on May 3, 2007.

BRATTON, KERRY M. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07461671

Filed – 03/23/07 *FTB's Counsel*

Taxpayer's Counsel
Mark T. Schieble

Paul Gifford

Foley & Lardner, LLP Attorneys At Law

Issue: Whether the penalty for the promotion of an abusive tax shelter provided for in section 19177 was

properly assessed to Plaintiff.

Year: 2003 Amount \$3,996,235.94 Penalty

Status: Case Management Conference scheduled for August 24, 2007. Hearing scheduled for May 3, 2007.

CITY NATIONAL CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC334772 Filed – 06/10/05

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District No. B189240

California Supreme Court No. S150563

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Kenneth R. Chiate, Mary S. Thomas Donald R. Currier

Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart, Oliver & Hedges, LLP Joseph M. O'Heron

Sherrill Johnson

Offices of the General Counsel

City National Bank

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiff improperly engaged in tax shelter transaction involving Regulated Investment Trusts (REITs) and Regulated Investment Companies (RICs) during the subject years.

- 2. Whether certain subsidiaries were exempt from California taxation as IRC 501(c)(15) entities.
- 3. Whether Plaintiff has satisfied the requirement of exhausting all administrative remedies in order to maintain a lawsuit.

<u>Years</u>: 1999 through 2003 <u>Amount</u> \$84,676,129.00

Status: Defendant/Respondent's Petition for Review denied on April 11, 2007.

CITY NATIONAL CORPORATION & Subs. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 06AS02275 Filed – 06/06/06

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

FTB's Counsel

Kenneth R. Chiate

Michael J. Cornez

Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart Oliver & Hedges, LLP

Sherrill Johnson

Offices of the General Counsel

City National Bank

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Plaintiffs improperly engaged in tax shelter transaction involving Real Estate

Investment Trusts (REITs).

<u>Year</u>: 2004 <u>Amount</u> \$23,900,000.00

Status: Discovery proceeding.

COLGATE-PALMOLIVE, CO. & SUBSIDIARIES v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 03AS00707

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>

St. L. G. SCH, G. L. A. B. L. G.

Eric J. Coffill, Carley A. Roberts

Steven J. Green

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the sales factor was properly calculated by excluding proceeds from short-term financial instruments and value added taxes assessed by foreign countries.

2. Whether the property factor needs to be adjusted to value property at its appreciated value to fairly reflect its activities in California.

Years: 1974 through 1982, 1984 through 1987, 1989 through 1991 Amount \$2,912,696.00

Status: Order to Stay Proceeding signed by Judge Virga on November 29, 2004, until a decision is reached in

the General Motors v. FTB case.

DELUCCHI, MARIO & KATHLEEN, et al. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 06AS02661 Filed – 06/22/06

*Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Harry Gordon Oliver II FIB'S Counsel

Michael J. Cornez

Attorney at Law

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs properly computed income on an installment sale.

- 2. Whether Plaintiffs may be deemed to have elected out of the installment method.
- 3. Whether Plaintiffs' gain on the sale of a stock qualified for exemption as Small Business Stock in 1995.

<u>Year</u>: 1995 <u>Amount</u> \$954,800.00

Status: Discovery proceeding.

DICON FIBEROPTICS, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC367885 Filed - 03/13/07<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Paul S. Chan and Angela E. Oh Mark Richelson

Bird, Marella, Boxer, Wolpert,

Nessim, Drooks & Lincenberg, P.C.

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Franchise Tax Board properly denied EZ Credits claimed by Plaintiff.

<u>Year</u>: Ending 03/31/07 <u>Amount</u> \$1,104,992.00

Status: Case Management Conference scheduled for July 12, 2007. Plaintiff's Summons and First

Amended Complaint filed on April 17, 2007.

DILTS, WALTER B. JR. AND PHYLLIS A. KAPPELER v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC04436496 Filed - 11/19/04

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

R. Todd Luoma Anne Michelle Burr

Law Office of Richard Todd Luoma

Issue: Whether Plaintiffs ceased to be California residents as of December 16, 1994.

<u>Years</u>: 1994 and 1995 <u>Amount</u> \$973,101.00

Status: Notice sent by the Court, Order to Show Cause continued to January 8, 2008.

DUFFIELD, David A. & Cheryl D. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07459331 Filed - 01/05/07<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Jeffrey M. Vesely David Lew

Kerne H. O. Matsubara, Annie H. Huang Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs exchange of PeopleSoft Stock for the stock of Nevada Pacific Development Corporation qualified as a tax-free exchange pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 17321.

2. Whether Plaintiffs were subject to the penalty imposed by section 19777.5.

- 3. Whether the penalty imposed by section 19777.5 meets Due Process requirements.
- 4. Whether Plaintiffs were entitled to an abatement of interest pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 19104.

<u>Year</u>: 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$11,159,001.25

Status: Discovery proceeding.

FREIDBERG, Edward and Traci Reynolds v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AM01181

Filed – 02/02/07

Taxpayer's Counsel

Edward Freidberg, Suzanne M. Alves

Freidberg & Parker

Freidberg & Parker

Freidberg & Parker

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Franchise Tax Board was required to credit the amount of a non-final judgment to satisfy

Plaintiffs' self-assessed taxes for years subsequent to those involved in the judgment.

Status: Defendant's Answer to Complaint for Recovery of Void Tax Assessments filed on April 4, 2007.

GARCIA, W. ROCKE AND GLENDA L. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC06456659 Filed -10/02/06 $\underline{Taxpayer's\ Counsel}$ William J. McLean Kristian Whitten

A Professional Law Corporation

<u>Issue</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs timely acquired replacement real property in compliance with the Internal Revenue Code section 1033.

- 2. Whether a decision by the State Board of Equalization precludes the assessment of penalties pursuant to section 19777.5.
- 3. Whether the penalty assessed by Section 19777.5 satisfies due process requirements.

<u>Year</u>: 1992 <u>Amount</u> \$616,065.66

Status: Discovery proceeding. Trial set for August 27, 2007. **Defendant's Reply Brief in Support of Motion to Strike Setting of Case for Jury Trial filed April 3, 2007.**

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY AND SUBSIDIRIES v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC06-449157

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Dist. Court No. A115530

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselAmy L. SilverteinDavid Lew

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

Jeffrey M. Vesely

Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the penalty imposed by section 19777.5(a) on amounts due and payable on March 31, 2005, for years beginning before January 31, 2003, violates the due process clause of the United States Constitution.

2. What is the meaning of "due and payable" for purposes of section 19777.5(a) of the Revenue and Taxation Code?

Years: (None) Amount \$0.00

Status: Defendant/Respondent's Request for Oral Argument filed on March 7, 2007. Plaintiffs/Appellants'

Request for Oral Argument filed on March 9, 2007.

GENERAL MILLS, INC. & SUBSIDIARIES v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC05-439929 Filed - 03/29/05 <u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Thomas H. Steele Joyce Hee

Andres Vallejo, Jeffrey S. Terraciano

Morrison & Foerster LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the Plaintiffs' payroll factor was properly computed by excluding foreign employee stock options.

- 2. Whether the Plaintiffs' sales factor was properly calculated by excluding receipts from commodities transactions and short-term financial instruments.
- 3. Whether federal RAR adjustments were properly taken into account.

Years: 1992 through 1997 Amount \$3,950,026.00

Status: Trial continued to May 10, 2007.

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION, et al. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC269404 Filed - 03/06/02

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District No. B165665

California Supreme Court No. S127086

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselCharles R. AjalatStephen LewLaw Office of Ajalat, Polley & AyoobDonald Currier

Joseph O'Heron

Filed - 02/03/06

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether gross receipts from the disposition of marketable securities were properly excluded from the sales factor.

- 2. Whether interest income was properly characterized as business income.
- 3. Whether dividends received with respect to stock representing less than a 50% voting interest were properly classified as business income.
- 4. Whether the limitation on deductions prescribed by sections 24402 and 24410 resulted in unconstitutional discriminatory taxation.
- 5. Whether various receipts from intangible assets were properly excluded from the sales factor.
- 6. Whether research tax credits were properly limited to the entity incurring the expense.
- 7. Whether a deduction was properly denied with respect to foreign country taxes withheld on dividends.
- 8. Whether the taxpayer is entitled to an increased deduction with respect to depreciation on assets held by foreign country subsidiaries.
- 9. Whether the taxes determined to be owing by the Franchise Tax Board were properly computed and assessed.

<u>Years</u>: 1986 through 1988 <u>Amount</u> \$10,692,755.00

Status: Remittitur issued on April 9, 2007. Trial Setting Conference scheduled for May 23, 2007.

GOLDEN WEST HEALTH PLAN, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Greenberg Traurig, LLP

Issue: Whether Plaintiff made a valid S Corporation election for California purposes.

Years: 04/01/03 through 06/01/03 Amount \$669,045.00

Status: Trial scheduled for July 11, 2007. Mandatory Settlement Conference scheduled for June 25, 2007.

GONZALES, THOMAS J. II v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC06454297 Filed – 07/18/06

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Martin A. Schainbaum, Esq.

Martin A. Schainbaum, PLC

Filed – 07/18/06

FTB's Counsel

Paul D. Gifford

Joyce E. Hee

Issues: 1. Whether the loss claimed with respect to a Son of Boss transaction was allowable.

- 2. Whether a taxpayer self-reporting under VCI is eligible for interest suspension pursuant to section 19116.
- 3. Whether the taxpayer is entitled to deduct legal expenses paid in connection with an investment.

Years: 2000 and 2001 Amount \$12,374,510.00

Status: Mandatory Settlement Conference scheduled for February 5, 2008. Trial scheduled for February 19, 2008.

HAMPTON, RICKEY, Estate of Irene Dorothy Hampton (deceased) v. Franchise Tax Board

Alameda Superior Court Docket No. WG07310386 Filed – 02/09/07

Taxpayer's Counsel

FTB's Counsel

Bernard F. Cummins

Randall P. Borcherding

Attorney At Law

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Plaintiffs are entitled to a refund of tax based on federal adjustments.

<u>Year</u>: 2003 <u>Amount</u> \$14,074.00

Status: Defendant's Answer to Complaint for Refund of Overpayment Estate Tax filed on April 25, 2007.

HARGIS, BOB & RUTH v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. GIC 876431 Filed – 12/05/06

*Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Kevin M. Bagley, Robert M. Shaughnessy

Domini Pham

Duckor, Stradling, Metzger & Wynne

A Law Corporation

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs were residents of California during the years at issue.

- 2. Whether a penalty for a dishonored check was properly assessed.
- 3. Whether the penalty provided for in section 19777.5 was properly assessed.

Years: 1999 and 2000 Amount \$915,873.40

Status: Discovery proceeding.

HILTON, ERIC & BITTEN v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC354308 Filed - 06/21/06<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Richard K. Semeta Filed - 06/21/06Anthony Sgherzi

A Professional Law Corporation

Issue: Whether a portion of the gain realized on the exercise of stock options by a non-resident was California

source income.

<u>Year</u> 1997 <u>Amount</u> \$27,346.98

Status: Discovery proceeding. Final Status Conference scheduled for May 3, 2007 and Court Trial scheduled

for May 14, 2007.

HYATT, GILBERT P. v. Franchise Tax Board

Clark County Nevada District Court No. A382999 Filed - 01/06/98

Nevada Supreme Court No. 47141

Taxpayer's Counsel

Thomas L. Steffen & Mark A. Hutchison Hutchison & Steffen, H. Bartow Farr III

FTB's Counsel James W. Bradshaw McDonald, Carano,

Wilson LLP

FTB's Counsel

Joyce Hee

Las Vegas, Nevada

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiff was a resident of California from September 26, 1991 through April 2, 1992.

2. Whether the Franchise Tax Board committed various torts with respect to plaintiff and is subject to a claim for damages.

3. Whether the Nevada courts have or should exercise jurisdiction over the Franchise Tax Board.

Years: 1991 and 1992 \$7,545,492.00 Tax Amount

\$5,659,119.00 Penalty

Nevada Supreme Court Status:

The case is pending before the Nevada Supreme Court on a writ action by Gilbert P. Hyatt.

THE LIMITED STORES, INC. AND AFFILIATES v. Franchise Tax Board

Alameda Superior Court Docket No. 837723-0 Filed - 04/09/01

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District Court No. A102915

California Supreme Court No. S136922

Taxpayer's Counsel Carley Roberts

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

Hollis L. Hyans

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

New York, NY

Issues: 1. Whether gross receipts from the sale of short-term financial instruments should be included in the sales factor.

2. Whether gain realized on the sale of a partial interest in a limited partnership formed from three subsidiaries constitutes business income.

Years: 1993 and 1994 Amount \$2,185,718.00

Status: Defendant/Respondent's Reply to Plaintiffs/Appellants' Supplemental Brief filed on March 14, 2007.

Plaintiff/Appellant's Supplemental Reply Brief filed on March 15, 2007.

MARKEN, DONALD W. & CLAUDINE H. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. 302520

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Dist. No. A091644

California Supreme Court No. S 104529

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Dis. No. A109715

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District No. A110668 (Attorneys' Fees)

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> William E. Taggart, Jr.

Taggart & Hawkins

FTB's Counsel

Filed - 04/05/99

Marguerite Stricklin

Issue: Whether Plaintiffs were residents of California in 1993.

Year: 1993 Amount \$244,012.00

Status: Unpublished Opinion filed on April 11, 2007, Judgment affirmed. Defendant/Respondent's

Petition for Rehearing filed on April 26, 2007.

MERCURY GENERAL CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. No. GCG07462688 Filed – 04/25/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Roy E. Crawford, Roburt J. Waldow

Heller, Ehrman, LLP

ant overanges was arenably

Julian Standen

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether a portion of Plaintiff's insurance subsidiary management expenses was properly disallowed under Rev. & Tax. Code § 24425.

2. Whether the amnesty penalty under Rev. & Tax. Code § 19101 violates the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution, applies only retroactively, or attaches only after a liability becomes due and payable.

Years: 12/31/93 through 12/31/96 Amount \$7,585,601.28

Status: Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint served personally on the Franchise Tax Board on April 26,

2007.

MONTGOMERY WARD LLC v. Franchise Tax Board v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. GIC802767 Filed - 12/30/02

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Antolin, Pilar M. Sansone, Amy Silverstein

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

<u>FTB's Counsel</u> Domini Pham

ntolin, Pilar M. Sansone, Amy Silverstein Domini Phar

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether proceeds from the sale, maturity or other disposition of short-term financial instruments were properly excluded from the sales factor.

2. Whether section 24402 Rev. & Tax. Code is constitutional.

<u>Years</u>: 1989 through 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$2,694,192.00

Status: Trial scheduled for October 5, 2007.

NEW GAMING SYSTEMS, INC. & AKA INDUSTRIES, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 03AS05705 Filed - 10/10/03

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Robert R. Rubin FIB's Counsel

Michael Cornez

McDonough, Holland & Allen, PC

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether New Gaming Systems, Inc., timely filed its suit for refund for the income year ended March 31, 1996.

- 2. Whether a declaratory relief action can be brought to prevent the collection of tax.
- 3. Whether a suit for refund can be maintained for a year in which the amount of tax has not been paid in full.
- 4. Whether Plaintiffs are liable for California taxes on income generated from leases for operating Indian casinos.

<u>Years</u>: 1996 and 1997 <u>Amount</u> \$111,587.87

Status: Trial Setting Conference held on March 19, 2007, Trial set for July 23, 2007.

NORTHWEST ENERGETIC SERVICES, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No.CGC05-437721 Filed – 01/15/05

Court of Appeal 1st Appellate Court Dist. No. A114805

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Court Dist. No. A115841 (Attorneys' Fees)

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Court Dist. No. A115950 (Attorneys' Fees)

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> <u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin Marguerite Stricklin

Silverstein & Pomerantz

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Revenue and Taxation Code section 17942, which imposes a tax upon the "total income from

all sources reportable to this state" of LLC registered with the Secretary of State, violates the Due

Process Clause and Commerce Clauses.

<u>Years</u>: 12/31/97 through 12/31/01 <u>Amount</u> **\$25,067.00 Fees**

\$ 3,764.29 Penalty

Status: Defendant/Appellant's Opening Brief filed on April 20, 2007.

PARÉ, DAVID F. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. IC872806 Filed – 09/21/06

Court of Appeal, 3rd Appellate Court No. A60614

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

David F. Paré, In Pro Per

Leslie Branman Smith

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the child of an individual who lives with the plaintiff qualifies the individual for head-of-household filing status.

2. Whether the plaintiff has satisfied the requirements for bringing a suit for refund.

<u>Years</u>: 2000 through 2003 <u>Amount</u> \$5,185.00

Status: Plaintiff's Notice Designating Record on Appeal filed on March 15, 2007. Plaintiff's Notice of

Appeal/Cross-Appeal filed on March 15, 2007.

PLAYMATES TOYS, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC344785 Filed – 12/19/05

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Filed – 12/19/05

Edward Gartenberg, Ellis G. Wasson and Kristin L. Sciarra

Joseph M. O'Heron

Gartenberg, Gelfand, Wasson & Selden, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Defendant Franchise Tax Board properly computed the numerator of the taxpayer's California

sales factor by assigning sales made from Hong Kong to California.

Years: 1988 through 1990 Amount \$1,582,288.00

Status: Discovery proceeding. Notice of Status Conference rescheduled to July 12, 2007.

SHIMMON, Edward & Anneliese v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC363822 Filed – 12/22/06

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Charles P. Rettig, Sharyn M. Fisk

Donald Currier

Hochman, Salkin, Rettig, Toscher & Perez, P.C.

<u>Issue:</u> Whether a taxpayer filing under the first option of VCI was eligible for the interest suspension

provided by section 19116.

<u>Year</u>: 1999 <u>Amount</u> \$515,422.00 Interest

Status: Case Management Conference held on April 17, 2007.

SQUARE D COMPANY v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC05442465 Filed – 06/21/05

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Filed – 06/21/05

Allan L. Schare, Kimberly M. Reeder Paul Gifford

McDermott Will & Emery LLP

Palo Alto, Ca.

Richard A. Hanson

McDermott Will & Emery LLP

Chicago, IL

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Palatine Hills Leasing, which invested in leverage lease transactions, was part of the unitary business conducted by Square D Company.

2. Whether the income of Palatine Hills Leasing constituted business income of the unitary business conducted by Square D Company.

3. How the proceeds from the short-term investment of funds should be reflected in the sales factor of the apportionment formula.

<u>Years</u>: 1985 through 1990 <u>Amount</u> \$5,635,087.40

Status: Statement of Decision in favor of Defendant Franchise Tax Board on April 11, 2007, Judgment

entered in favor of Defendant Franchise Tax Board on April 30, 2007.

TOY'S "R" US, INC. & AFFILIATES v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 01AS04316 Filed - 07/17/01

Court of Appeal, 4th Appellate Court No. C045386

California Supreme Court No. S143422

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Eric J. Coffill

FTB's Counsel
Michael J. Cornez

Carley A. Roberts

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: Whether gross receipts from the sale of short-term financial investment were properly excluded from

the documentation of the sales factor.

Years: 1991 through 1994 Amount \$5,342,117.00

Status: Case is transferred to the Court of Appeal on November 15, 2006, with directions to vacate its decision

and to reconsider the cause of action in light of Microsoft v. Franchise Tax Board (2006) 39 Cal.4th 750 and General Motors v. Franchise Tax Board (2006) 39 Cal.4th 773. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 29.3(d).)

VENTAS FINANCE I, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. 05-440001 Filed – 04/01/05

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Court No. A116277

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Marguerite Stricklin

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

Issue: Whether Revenue and Taxation Code section 17942, which imposes a tax based upon the "total income

from all sources reportable to this state" of LLC registered with the Secretary of State, violates the Due

Process Clause and Commerce Clause.

<u>Years</u>: 2001 through 2003 <u>Amount</u> \$29,580.00

Status: Defendant/Appellant's Stipulation of Extension of time to file Opening Brief to May 8, 2007 filed.

Extension granted by the Court on April 9, 2007. Plaintiff/Appellant's Opposition filed on

April 10, 2007.